

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated January 24, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 9 and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1-13 are amended for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-13 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents.

Claims 5 and 7-8 are objected to for informalities. Claims 5 and 7-8 are amended herein to cure the noted problems. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 7-8 are in proper form and it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,734,636 to Sanford ("Sanford"). Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sanford in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043168 to Koyama ("Koyama"). Claims 19-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Sanford in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,706 to Shimoda ("Shimoda"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are allowable over Sanford alone and in view of any of Koyama and Shimoda for at least the following reasons.

Sanford shows a driving circuit for an OLED that utilizes NFETs Q301, Q302, Q303 and a data storage capacitor Cs310 as the driving circuit. (See, FIG. 3 and Col. 6, lines 16-20.) The Office Action equates the NFET Q302 to the "amorphous silicon or microcrystalline silicon second drive NMOS transistor for supplying a holding voltage to the anode of the display element" of claim 1. However, as shown in FIG. 3 of Sanford, the NFET transistor Q302 is not directly connected to the anode of the display element, but in fact, is shown connected to the anode of the display element through the capacitor Cs310.

It is respectfully submitted that the device of claim 1 is not

anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Sanford. For example, Sanford does not disclose or suggest, a device that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added) "an electroluminescent display element; an amorphous silicon or microcrystalline silicon first drive NMOS transistor connected between the anode of the display element and a power supply line; a storage capacitor between the anode of the display element and the gate of the first drive transistor; and an amorphous silicon or microcrystalline silicon second drive NMOS transistor directly connected to the anode of the display element for supplying a holding voltage to the anode of the display element" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in each of claims 9 and 14. Each of Koyama and Shimoda are introduced for allegedly showing other elements of the claims and as such, do nothing to cure the deficiencies in Sanford.


Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9 and 14 are patentable over Sanford alone and in view of any of Koyama and Shimoda and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-8, 10-13 and 15-16 respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 9 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately

patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 21, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101